From the INTERNATIONAL BUREAU

NOTIFICATION CONCERNING TRANSMITTAL OF COPY OF INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY (CHAPTER I OF THE PATENT COOPERATION TREATY)

(PCT Rule 44bis.1(c))

To:

ABELEV, Gary Dorsey & Whitney LLP 250 Park Avenue New York, NY 10177 ETATS-UNIS D'AMERIQUE Patent Mail Docketed JUN 2 U 2007

Date of mailing (day/month/year) 07 June 2007 (07.06.2007)

Applicant's or agent's file reference

185906/PCT

IMPORTANT NOTICE

International application No. PCT/US2005/042408 International filing date (day/month/year) 21 November 2005 (21.11.2005) Priority date (day/month/year) 24 November 2004 (24.11.2004)

Applicant

THE GENERAL HOSPITAL CORPORATION et al

The International Bureau transmits herewith a copy of the international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I of the Patent Cooperation Treaty)

DOCKETED

The International Bureau of WIPO 34, chemin des Colombettes 1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland

Authorized officer

Beate Giffo-Schmitt

Facsimile No. +41 22 338 82 70

e-mail: pt03.pct@wipo.int

PATENT COOPERATION TREAT

PCT

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY

(Chapter I of the Patent Cooperation Treaty)

(PCT Rule 44bis)

Applicant's or agent's file reference 185906/PCT	FOR FURTHER ACTION	See item 4 below
International application No. PCT/US2005/042408	International filing date (day/month/year) 21 November 2005 (21.11.2005)	Priority date (day/month/year) 24 November 2004 (24.11.2004)
International Patent Classification (8th See relevant information in Form F	n edition unless older edition indicated) PCT/ISA/237	
Applicant THE GENERAL HOSPITAL CORF	PORATION	

1.	This international preliminary re International Searching Authorit	port on patentability (Chapter I) is issued by the International Bureau on behalf of the y under Rule 44 bis.1(a).
2.	In the attached sheets, any refere	of 7 sheets, including this cover sheet. nce to the written opinion of the International Searching Authority should be read as a reference eport on patentability (Chapter I) instead.
3.	This report contains indications i	relating to the following items:
	Box No. I	Basis of the report
	Box No. II	Priority
	Box No. III	Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
	Box No. IV	Lack of unity of invention
	Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
	Box No. VI	Certain documents cited
	Box No. VII	Certain defects in the international application
	Box No. VIII	Certain observations on the international application
4.	The International Bureau will connot, except where the applicant mate (Rule 44bis .2).	mmunicate this report to designated Offices in accordance with Rules 44bis.3(c) and 93bis.1 but takes an express request under Article 23(2), before the expiration of 30 months from the priority

Date of issuance of this report
30 May 2007 (30.05.2007)

The International Bureau of WIPO
34, chemin des Colombettes
1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland

Facsimile No. +41 22 338 82 70

E-mail: pt03.pct@wipo.int

e-mail: pt03.pct@wipo.int

From the WIPO INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY To: WRITTEN OPINION OF THE see form PCT/ISA/220 INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43bis.1) Date of mailing (day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet) Applicant's or agent's file reference FOR FURTHER ACTION see form PCT/ISA/220 See paragraph 2 below Priority date (day/month/year) International application No. International filing date (day/month/year) 24.11.2004 21.11.2005 PCT/US2005/042408 International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC INV. G01B9/02 A61B5/00 Applicant THE GENERAL HOSPITAL CORPORATION This opinion contains indications relating to the following items: 1. ☑ Box No. I Basis of the opinion Box No. II Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability Box No. III ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial Box No. V applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement Box No. VI Certain documents cited ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application **FURTHER ACTION** 2. If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notifed the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220. 3. Authorized Officer Date of completion of Name and mailing address of the ISA: this opinion European Patent Office see form Kunz, L D-80298 Munich PCT/ISA/210 Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d

REC'D 2 1 MAK ZUUD

Telephone No. +49 89 2399-2628

Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/US2005/042408

	Box N	o. I Basis of the opinion			
1.	With re	gard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of:			
	⊠ th	e international application in the language in which it was filed			
	□ a bu	ranslation of the international application into , which is the language of a translation furnished for the rposes of international search (Rules 12.3(a) and 23.1 (b)).			
2.	With re	n regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application an essary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:			
	a. type of material:				
		a sequence listing			
		table(s) related to the sequence listing			
	b. forn	nat of material:			
		on paper			
		in electronic form			
	c. time	e of filing/furnishing:			
		contained in the international application as filed.			
		filed together with the international application in electronic form.			
		furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.			
3	h C	addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto as been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional opies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as ppropriate, were furnished.			
4	. Additi	onal comments:			
-	Box	No. II Priority			
1	C	The validity of the priority claim has not been considered because the International Searching Authority loes not have in its possession a copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed or, where equired, a translation of that earlier application. This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date (Rules 43 <i>bis</i> .1 and 64.1) is the claimed priority date.			
2	ŀ	This opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim has been found invalid (Rules 43 <i>bis</i> .1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international ling date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.			
,	الماماد ا	ional observations, if necessary:			

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/US2005/042408

	the important and industrial			
Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability				
The questions whether the claimed invention appears to be novel, to involve an inventive step (to be non obvious), or to be industrially applicable have not been examined in respect of				
	the entire international application			
	claims Nos. 2-16,19-57			
because:				
	the said international application, or the said claims Nos. relate to the following subject matter which does not require an international search (specify):			
	the description, claims or drawings (indicate particular elements below) or said claims Nos. are so unclear that no meaningful opinion could be formed (specify):			
⊠	the claims, or said claims Nos. 2-16,19-57 are so inadequately supported by the description that no meaningful opinion could be formed (specify):			
	see separate sheet			
	no international search report has been established for the whole application or for said claims Nos.			
	a meaningful opinion could not be formed without the sequence listing; the applicant did not, within the prescribed time limit:			
	furnish a sequence listing on paper complying with the standard provided for in Annex C of the Administrative Instructions, and such listing was not available to the International Searching Authority in a form and manner acceptable to it.			
	furnish a sequence listing in electronic form complying with the standard provided for in Annex C of the Administrative Instructions, and such listing was not available to the International Searching Authority in a form and manner acceptable to it.			
	pay the required late furnishing fee for the furnishing of a sequence listing in response to an invitation under Rules 13 ter.1(a) or (b).			
	a meaningful opinion could not be formed without the tables related to the sequence listings; the applicant did not, within the prescribed time limit, furnish such tables in electronic form complying with the technical requirements provided for in Annex C-bis of the Administrative Instructions, and such tables were not available to the International Searching Authority in a form and manner acceptable to it.			
	the tables related to the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing, if in electronic form only, do not comply with the technical requirements provided for in Annex C-bis of the Administrative Instructions.			
	See Supplemental Box for further details			

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)

Yes: Claims

No: Claims

1-57

Inventive step (IS)

Yes: Claims

No: Claims

1-57

1-57

Industrial applicability (IA)

Yes: Claims

No: Claims

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

Box No. VI Certain documents cited

1. Certain published documents (Rules 43bis.1 and 70.10)

and / or

2. Non-written disclosures (Rules 43bis.1 and 70.9)

see form 210

The following document (D) is referred to in this Written Opinion of the International Searching Authority:

D1: WO 2004 / 057 266 A2

1. Objections under Article 6 PCT (Clarity)

- 1.1 The variations in wording between independent claims 1, 19, 32 and 37 as well as between the alternatives claimed in independent claims 1, 19 and 37 are such that the number of claims is not reasonable in consideration with the nature of the invention (Rule 6.1 (a) PCT). Furthermore, by giving seven different definitions for the same invention, the subject matter for which protection is sought is not clearly defined by the claims, contrary to the requirements of Article 6 PCT. Therefore, a statement concerning the requirements of Article 33 PCT is given only for the first claimed invention.
- 1.2 The claims are drafted in so vague terms and on such a level of abstraction that they are not clear in the light of the description and lack support by the description (Article 6 PCT).
 - The description concerns OCT interferometry for endoscopes (see pages 1 to 3, and figure 2). The goal of the invention is the provision of an interferometer where reference and sample arms traverse substantially the same path (see page 3, lines 31 to 33), in order to obviate problems associated with conventional fibre optic OCT probes (see page 3, lines 6 to 28). This goal is achieved by providing the beam splitter of the interferometer in the distal end of the endoscope, such that the "reference arm" becomes placed within the body of the catheter (see page 7, lines 5 to 16, and figures 3 and 4).

Independent claim 1, for example, is in its second embodiment drafted in so vague terms that its subject matter is anticipated by a bathroom including a mirror. Such a bathroom is namely an arrangement adapted to propagate at least one electromagnetic radiation (light), comprising: a probe housing (the bathroom itself) and a section which is at least partially situated in the probe housing (area in front of the mirror) and configured to receive a first portion of the at least one electro-magnetic

radiation from a sample (e.g. person in front of the mirror) and a second portion of the at least one electro-magnetic radiation from a reference (mirror), wherein the first and second portions travel along substantially the same path (between the person and the mirror).

Such a level of abstraction of the claims is not appropriate and does not allow a positive statement as concerns the requirements of Article 33 PCT.

1.3 Claims 2 to 16 refer to the features of the second embodiment "defined" in independent claim 1. Therefore, these claims have to be excluded from the statement concerning the requirements of Article 33 PCT, which is given only for the first claimed invention.

2. Statement Concerning the Requirements of Article 33 PCT

- 2.1 Document D1 (see in particular page 10, line 1, to page 17, line 31, and figures 1, 2 and 5) describes an arrangement (36, 36a) adapted to propagate at least one electro-magnetic radiation (light from laser 43, 43a), comprising: a probe housing (36 in figure 1) and an interferometer (see figures 2 and 5) situated within the probe housing (36, 36a).
 - For these reasons, the subject matter of independent claim 1 is anticipated by document D1 and thus not new.
- 2.2 The features of claims 17 and 18 are also known from document D1 and thus do not add novel subject matter to the device defined in independent claim 1. Claim 17: the interferometer shown in figures 2 and 5 is a Michelson interferometer; Claim 18: the interferometer includes a section (I₁) configured to receive a first portion of the at least one electro-magnetic radiation from a sample (9) and a second portion of the at least one electro-magnetic radiation from a reference (surface 53, 53a), wherein the first and the second portions travel along substantially the same path (except for I₂).
- 2.3 The subject matter of the first claimed invention is also anticipated by DE-A-103 51 319, which is, however, a state of the art according to Rule 64.3 PCT.